

3618



Wolfram GORISCH
Dueppeler Str. 20
D 81929 Muenchen
Phone: +49 89 93930253
Fax: +49 89 93930254
Email: wgorisch@t-online.de

United States Patent and Trademark Office
Commissioner for patents
Hau Van Phan, examiner
P.O.Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
U.S.A.

RECEIVED

FEB 05 2004

01/23/2004

Application No. 10/026,567
GORISCH, WOLFRAM
Examiner: Hau V Phan
Art Unit 3618
Final Office action, mailing date 12/12/2003

GROUP 3600

The following is my reply to the Office action.

Ad 1 and 2:

A substitute specification (single sided) is enclosed. Substitute drawings are enclosed, including drawings deleted and drawing renumbering.

Statement:

I herewith state and declare that this substitute specification as well as the prior substitute specification includes no new matter.
(signed with this reply)

Ad 3:

Noted

Ad 4:

Fig. 6 (and Fig. 9) belong to a non-elected species and are to be considered as withdrawn.
See substitute drawings.

Ad 5:

A substitute abstract is enclosed

Ad 6:

Correction according to claim objections is provided. See amended claims.

Ad 7:
Noted

Ad 8:
The term "extension" refers to the same item. To my opinion this may be clear enough for the reader as the extensions from "a platform which comprises extensions" and "extensions of the platform" should mean the same. However, the text still seemed to be indistinct in using the indefinite term "extensions". I tried to make this clearer in introducing "at least one extension".

If this amendment is still not sufficiently clear, I propose to use the expression "... said at least one extension".

Additional item:

In claim 1 line 11 the term "... second cross-guide is universally joined with ..." seems to exclude any embodiment from my invention which does not use a universal joint at this place. The original intention was, however, that the second cross-guide, by design, is allowed (not: forced) to swivel around the axis with the "skew" angle α . This complies with the original wording of claim 1. Now, instead of saying "universally joined" I would rather say "jointed" (Websters: to joint: to fasten together by a joint, jointed: provided with joints). To my opinion this expression does not sacrifice clarity. Such a joint could be universal or rotational. It must not be universal.

Please concur.

Ad 9:
The claims are amended to overcome the rejections.

Ad 10:
Noted

Ad 11:
Noted. I understand that this is my first reply and possibly an advisory action will be taken by USPTO. I tried to fulfil any requirement. If there still remains any formal inconsistency which could be settled informally, please use email (wgorisch@t-online.de) to give advice. I will try to comply immediately.



Wolfram Gorisch

Attachments